



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,204	02/26/2002	Yuki Yamamoto	1619.1018	5091
21171	7590	04/21/2005	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			DOAN, DUYN MY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/082,204

Applicant(s)

YAMAMOTO, YUKI

Examiner

Duyen M. Doan

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/26/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detail Action

Claims 1-25 are presented for examination.

Examiner do not consider the submitted IDS because the translation version is missing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 5, 11, 18, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takakura et al (us 2002/0007396) (hereinafter Takakura).

As regarding claims 5, 18 Takakura discloses sending a server of said system an entrance request with the current location of the terminal or a user-specified location attached, requesting for permission to enter an area chat room provided by said system and associated with a specific location (pg.4, paragraph 56-58, pg.6, paragraph 88-91); sending the server of said system a remark request, with the current location of said terminal attached, when the user is in said area chat room (pg.4, paragraph 56-58, pg.6, paragraph 88-91); receiving the current locations and remarks of all the participants as well as map data corresponding to the range of said area chat room from said system and displaying said map data, charted locations of the participants, and remarks of the

Art Unit: 2143

participants on a display screen of said terminal when the user is in said area chat room (pg.4, paragraph 56-58, pg.6, paragraph 88-91); and informing the server of said system about the current location of said terminal at designated intervals or on designated occasions (pg.4, paragraph 56-58, pg.6, paragraph 88-91).

As regarding claims 11, 24 Takakura discloses sending said system a room creation request to create an area chat room with its range specified based on the current location of said terminal or a user-specified location (pg.6-pg7, paragraph 92-97).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6, 13, 14-17, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takakura et al (us 2002/0007396) (hereinafter Takakura) in view of Greene (us pat 6,666,8173).

As regarding claim 1, Takakura discloses managing access to area chat rooms each associated with a specific location (pg.2, paragraph 21); accepting an entrance request, with the current location of the terminal or a user-specified location attached, from said terminal for permission to enter one of said area chat rooms, and allowing

Art Unit: 2143

entrance into any appropriate area chat room whose area includes said current location or specified location (pg.4, paragraph 56-58); accepting a remark request, with the current location of the terminal attached, from said terminal for permission to make a remark, and delivering the remark to the terminals of the other participants of said area chat room by attaching the location of said terminal (pg.4, paragraph 56-58); Takakura does not expressly disclose accepting location update information from said terminal and delivering said location update information to the terminals of the other participants of said area chat room. Greene teaches accepting location update information from said terminal and delivering said location update information to the terminals of the other participants of said area chat room (col.5, lines 15-24).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have updated the location information of the participants and deliver that updated information to other participants in the chat room for the purpose of providing status and location information of users instantaneously and automatically without the user having to provide updates of his current status or location. The problem of the user forgetting to make such updates is avoided as well as each user is provided with instant information as to the status and/or location of all the users (col.5, lines 66-67 to col.6, lines 1-4).

As regarding claim 2, Takakura-Greene disclose accepting any inquiry about the current location of another participant in the area chat room from said terminal, acquiring the current location from the terminal of said other participant if the terminal of

said other participant permits sending a reply, and sending the current location of said other participant in return (see Takakura pg.4, paragraph 57-58).

As regarding 3, Takakura-Greene disclose creating an area chat room by specifying a range based on the current location of said terminal or a user-specified location if a request to create an area chat room is received from said terminal (see Takakura pg.6-pg7, paragraph 92-97).

As regarding claim 4, Takakura-Greene disclose registering and managing information about any subscriber who wants to be notified if an area chat room whose area includes the current location of the terminal or a user-specified location is created (see Takakura pg.7, paragraph 109); and notifying said subscriber's terminal about creation of any area chat room which agrees with the information about said subscriber (see Takakura pg.8, paragraph 110).

As regarding claim 6, Takakura discloses all the limitations of claim 5 above, but fail to disclose entrance request contains direction whether or not the current location attached to said entrance request is to be shown to other participants. Greene teaches entrance request contains direction whether or not the current location attached to said entrance request is to be shown to other participants (col.5, lines 36-48).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Greene with the method of Takakura to have the entrance request contains direction.whether or not the current location

Art Unit: 2143

attached to said entrance request is to be shown to other participants for the purpose of privacy (see Greene col.5, lines 36-48).

As regarding claim 13, the limitations are similar to claim 1, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 1.

As regarding claim 14, the limitations are similar to claim 1, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 1.

As regarding claim 15, the limitations are similar to claim 2, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 2.

As regarding claim 16, the limitations are similar to claim 3, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 3.

As regarding claim 17, the limitations are similar to claim 4, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 4.

As regarding claim 19, the limitations are similar to claim 6, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 6.

Claims 7-10, 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takakura et al (us 2002/0007396) (hereinafter Takakura) in view of Kelts (us 20020112237).

As regarding claims 7, 20 Takakura discloses all the limitations of claim 5, but fail to disclose the charted location of the latest speaker is indicated by a shape, color, or method different from those for other speakers when charting the locations of the participants who are in said area chat room. Kelts teaches the charted location of the

Art Unit: 2143

latest speaker is indicated by a shape, color, or method different from those for other speakers when charting the locations of the participants who are in said area chat room (pg.8, paragraph 88, different colored map items may represent different types of programming genres, different programming characteristics...one or more of the following map item icon characteristics may be varied in a dynamic manner: shape, size, color, design, orientation, text label...).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Kelts with the method of Takakura to have different participants represent in different shapes and colors for the purpose of convey useful information to the user in an easy to interpret manner (see Kelts pg.8, paragraph 88).

As regarding claims 8, 21 the limitations are similar to claim 7, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 7.

As regarding claims 9, 22 the limitations are similar to claim 7, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 7.

As regarding claims 10, 23 Takakura-Kelts disclose after accepting a remark location search request, calculating the distance between the location at the time of said remark and the current location of the terminal and displaying it on the display of said terminal (see Takakura pg.4, paragraph 58, pg.5, paragraph 67, pg.8, paragraph 115).

Art Unit: 2143

Claims 12, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takakura et al (us 2002/0007396) (hereinafter Takakura) in view of Hatlelid (us pat 6,772,195) (hereinafter Hatlelid).

As regarding claim 12, Takakura discloses all the limitations of claim 5 and 11 above, but fail to disclose, room creation request contains information to limit the participants who are allowed in the area chat room created. Hatlelid teaches room creation request contains information to limit the participants who are allowed in the area chat room created (col.7, lines 1-18).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hatlelid with the method of Takakura to have room creation request contains information to limit the participants who are allowed in the area chat room created for the purpose of restricting other participants from participate in private chat room (see Hatlelid col.7, lines 1-18).

As regarding claim 25, the limitations are similar to claim 12, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 12.

Art Unit: 2143

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duyen M. Doan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4226. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner
Duyen Doan
Art unit 2143

DD


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100